



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/650,260	08/29/2000	Yao-Ching Liu	16415-0020	9482

32294 7590 05/26/2004

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
14TH FLOOR
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182

EXAMINER

LEE, TIMOTHY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2662	10

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/650,260

Applicant(s)

LIU ET AL.

Examiner

Timothy Lee

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6-10,16,17,21-24,27-31 and 33-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5,11-15,18-20,25,26,32 and 36-40 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 6-10, 16, 17, 21-24, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giroux et al. (US 2002/0089933) in view of Yang et al. (US 6,097,698).
3. Regarding claims 1, 16 and 27, Giroux et al. discloses a method for detecting and controlling congestion in a multi-port shared memory switch in a communications network. As shown in Fig. 1, the system comprises inputs for receiving data traffic from a plurality of sources (plurality of receive ports). See paragraph 0005. The system also has a shared memory buffer having output queues configured for each of the output ports (a plurality of transport ports... a shared memory providing a shared memory space for temporary storage of data packets received via the receive ports). See paragraph 0006. With the output queues, it is inherent that the system will determine to which output port a received packet is destined (determining a destination of the transmit ports associated with said received data packet). The system also includes local congestion monitoring means setting a queue length threshold for each output queue to monitor output queue length and to provide queue congestion information when the length of any of the output queues exceeds the queue length threshold (determining whether the destination transmit port is currently congested by determining whether a number of packets currently stored in the shared memory that are to be transmitted via said destination transmit port exceeds a

predetermined congestion threshold). See paragraph 0007. Giroux et al. also discloses using any congestion control mechanism, like early packet discard, to alleviate the congestion problem if it occurs (dropping the received packet if the destination transmit port is currently congested). See paragraph 0004. Giroux et al. does not expressly disclose determining whether the associated receive port is currently saturated. Yang et al. discloses a discarding method where the control element of the system can discard a cell received by the switching node, depending on if a threshold level of credits has been surpassed. See col. 7, lines 43-55. Thus, in effect, the system determines if a certain input has exceeded its fair share of the bandwidth. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings from Yang et al. in the system disclosed by Giroux et al. to also account for the incoming saturation as well as the output congestion. One would have been motivated to do this to ensure that a certain input doesn't dominate the input and take over too much space in the buffer. Fairer access can be achieved by also taking into account has been inputted by each specific input.

4. Regarding claim 1 more specifically, Giroux et al. discloses that a local congestion flag is set when a given output queue exceeds the certain threshold, and the control congestion mechanisms are applied to the connection destined to this queue. It is inherent in this statement that the system produces some sort of signal indicating to the control congestion mechanisms that the output queue has reached the congestion state (generate an associated output full signal indicative of whether said associated transmit port is congested).

5. Regarding claim 16 more specifically, it is inherent in Giroux et al. that there were some sort of communication signals sent to the receive ports to indicate whether to drop or move the packet to the output queues—the controlling section must have made a decision as to whether or

not to retain the packet. Neither Giroux et al. nor Yang et al. expressly discloses generating filter signals for indicating that a received packet is destined for a congested one of the transmit ports. However, it would have been obvious to generate one of these signals in the combined system of Giroux et al. and Yang et al.. One would have been motivated to do this because sending this filter signal and informing the system that the packet will be dropped if it's continued to be sent will save on sending resources that could be used for other packets.

6. Regarding claims 2 and 17, in looking at the computer code disclosed in between paragraphs 0026 and 0027 of Giroux et al., the variable Output_Qlength (Q_i) can be considered a "counter" (an input counter) that is compared against Queue_Threshold (Q_i), which be can considered the "drop threshold" (drop based on a comparison between said input count value and said drop threshold value). Giroux et al. also discloses that the algorithm can be run as a background process of can be triggered by cell or packet arrival events, so the process can be "enabled" at any time (generate a count enable signal, and to assert the signal). See paragraph 0026.

7. Regarding claims 6 and 21, as mentioned previously, the computer code disclosed by Giroux et al. has counters that are compared against predetermined threshold values.

8. Regarding claim 7, as mentioned previously, it is inherent that transmit signals or drop signal will be generated by the system to indicate which packets to retain and send. This will cause the certain packets to be dropped if the connection is saturated and congested.

9. Regarding claims 8 and 22, as mentioned previously, the "enable signal" can be invoked at any time because the algorithm of Goroux et al. can be run at any time.

10. Regarding claims 9, and 23, as shown in Fig. 1 of Giroux et al., any one of the input ports can be connected to any one of the outputs through the shared memory manager. Giroux et al. does not expressly disclose that the lines are bi-directional, but it would have been obvious to add queues on the input side, thus making the system symmetrical and bi-directional. One would have been motivated to do this because it would have given the system in Giroux et al. more flexibility when it came to traffic that was flowing in both directions.

11. Regarding claims 10 and 24, Giroux et al. discloses that the fair share threshold is determined by finding the product of the buffer size and the buffer threshold and dividing the product by the number of output port queues. See paragraph 0011.

12. Regarding claim 28, Giroux et al. discloses a global congestion monitoring means that provides congestion information if the traffic to the shared memory exceeds the shared memory buffer threshold (determining whether a currently occupied portion of the shared memory space is greater than or equal to a predetermined threshold portion of the memory space). See paragraph 0008. Neither Giroux et al. nor Yang et al. discloses the counting of packets only after if is realized that the occupied portion is great than or equal to the threshold portion or resetting the counter if it's not great than or equal to the threshold portion. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to do so. One would have been motivated to do this because there is no need to waste resources and keep a count if the level of occupancy is not above the threshold.

13. Regarding claim 29, it is inherent that the input counter would be increased with each new input and be decreased with each time one of those packets is transmitted.

Art Unit: 2662

14. Claims 30, 31, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giroux et al. in view of Yang et al., further in view of Basso et al. (US 5,787,071) and in light of the rejection to claim 27.

15. Regarding claims 30 and 31, neither Giroux et al. nor Yang et al. expressly discloses asserting a backpressure signal when a backpressure threshold has been exceeded. Basso et al. discloses generating backpressure signals when a threshold has been reached. See col. 2, lines 34-58. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a backpressure signal if the threshold has been exceeded. One would have been motivated to do this because sometimes the inputs become too aggressive and simply dropping packets would not be the most efficient way of controlling the system—it would be more efficient to tell the input to slow down its transfers.

16. Regarding claims 33 and 34, as shown in Fig. 1 of Giroux et al., any one of the input ports can be connected to any one of the outputs through the shared memory manager. Giroux et al. does not expressly disclose that the lines are bi-directional, but it would have been obvious to add queues on the input side, thus making the system symmetrical and bi-directional. One would have been motivated to do this because it would have given the system in Giroux et al. more flexibility when it came to traffic that was flowing in both directions.

17. Regarding claim 35, as mentioned previously, Giroux et al. discloses splitting up the memory into equal sections to come up with the thresholds.

Allowable Subject Matter

18. Claims 3-5, 11-15, 18-20, 25-26, 32, and 36-40 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed March 12, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to Applicant's argument that Yang et al. teaches nothing more than what has been alleged in Giroux et al., the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, Applicant contends that the buffer illustrated in Fig. 4 in Yang et al. is connected to the output of the switch, so the buffer is an output buffer, and packets are only dropped when the transmission port is congested. While it is true that the buffer is connected to the single output shown in Fig. 4, the buffer is also connected to the VCn inputs, so it can also be considered an input buffer. Furthermore, Yang et al. discloses that when the cell occupancy of the buffer exceeds a predetermined threshold level associated with a particular VCn, the control element 35 can discard a cell received by the switching node associated with the VCn. See col. 7, lines 42-50. Thus, Yang et al. teaches dropping packets when an input threshold has been exceeded. Because Yang et al. discloses this feature, there is proper motivation to combine the references, and the rejection is proper.

Conclusion

20. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy Lee whose telephone number is (703)305-7349. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (703)305-4744. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TLL


Application/Control Number: 09/650,260

Page 9

Art Unit: 2662

Timothy Lee

May 18, 2004



HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600